

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND
Case No. 1:25-cv-02029 (CJC)**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et. al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

CHIEF JUDGE GEORGE L. RUSSELL III, et al.,

Defendants.

**MOTION TO INTERVENE AS A CITIZEN TO PROTECT PUBLIC RIGHTS OR,
IN THE ALTERNATIVE, TO PARTICIPATE AS AMICUS CURIAE
(INCORPORATING AUTHORITY)**

Movant, appearing *pro se* and as a concerned citizen, respectfully moves this Court for leave to intervene in the above-captioned matter for the limited purpose of vindicating fundamental public rights implicated by the case. This Motion is grounded in the ancient common law prerogative of the citizen to intercede in *quo warranto* where individuals purporting to act on behalf of the Government act without lawful authority. *See generally*, Raoul Berger, *Standing to Sue in Public Actions: Is it a Constitutional Requirement?* 78 Yale L.J. 816 (1969). In the alternative, Movant respectfully requests leave to file as an *amicus curiae*, given the significant public interest at stake and the constitutional implications that risk being misapprehended absent broader participation.

ARGUMENT

Movant wishes to draw the Court’s attention to a foundational question that no one in this fusillade of litigation has addressed: How can one reason from the Constitution to “an oathbreaking adjudged insurrectionist who has not been absolved by Congress serve as President?” For reasons stated herein, Movant submits that this is logically impossible. In turn, that is dispositive of this matter, as the actions of a usurper to the national throne are void *ab initio*:

[W]hen the constitution or form of government remains unaltered and supreme, there can be no de facto department, or de facto office. The acts of the incumbents of such departments or office cannot be enforced conformably to the constitution, and can be regarded as valid only when the government is overturned.

Norton v. Shelby County, 118 U.S. 425, 443 (1886).

It is axiomatic that only the President can wield the executive Power, U.S. Const. art. II, § 1. and unless a man meets all the constitutionally prescribed qualifications for the office, he cannot serve in that capacity.

Norton is not just binding because it is precedent, but because it is consonant with constitutional theory. Specifically, it is consistent with America's unique concept of popular sovereignty, foreign to our British forebears. The Framers' views echoed those of Locke, who maintained that a usurper could never attain legitimate power. John Locke, *Second Treatise of Government* ch. XVIII (1689). *E.g.*, John Adams, *Novanglus* No. 5, Feb. 20, 1775; Thomas Jefferson, *Kentucky Resolution* (1798) (acts in excess of jurisdiction are void *ab initio*); George Washington, *Farewell Address* (Sept. 19, 1796) (the Constitution is the outer boundary of popular consent); *The Federalist* No. 84 (Hamilton) (same). The stirring prose of Thomas Paine distills the thought. "[I]n America **THE LAW IS KING**. For as in absolute governments the King is law, so in free countries the law ought to be King; and there ought to be no other." Thomas Paine, *Common Sense* (Philadelphia, R. Bell, 1776) (emphasis in original), reprinted in pt. III, ¶ 103 (Project Gutenberg, 1994). As long as we remain governed by the Constitution, either an occupant of an office has a legal right to discharge the duties of an office, or s/he does not. There is no third option.¹

¹ This is in direct contrast to the experience in medieval England during the Wars of the Roses (1455-1487), where factions vied over the kingship. As it wasn't entirely clear who the actual King was, Parliament enacted *The Treason Act*, 11 Hen. VII [1495], c. 1 ("noe person going with the Kinge to the Warres shalbe attaynt of treason"), creating the de facto officer doctrine. Translated from the Middle English, it forbade legal punishment of subjects who followed the orders of the de facto king, irrespective of whether he was legitimate or a usurper. **Importantly, it is NOT a common-law doctrine.**

I. DONALD TRUMP CANNOT SERVE AS PRESIDENT AS A MATTER OF LAW.

“But he hasn’t got anything on,” a little child said.
 ~ Hans Christian Andersen²

We all recall the tale from our childhood. A vain and self-absorbed emperor was obsessed with fine clothing. Two swindlers, posing as weavers, convince him they can make a suit so exquisite, it is invisible only to those unfit for their position or foolish. The emperor, eager to display his sophistication, hires them. The swindlers pretend to weave, and though no one—including the emperor, his court, and townspeople—can see the fabric, they all feign admiration, to avoid seeming incompetent or foolish.

But then, a child speaks truth to power.

Movant is bemused by the armies of Ivy League-educated sages in white-shoe law firms arguing at \$3,500 an hour over whether President Trump can do this, or that. But none have asked the predicate question: “Is Donald Trump our President at all?”

Here, the ‘two swindlers’ in our real-life tale are Chief Justice Roberts and his colleagues. They wove a translucent legal negligée in *Trump v. Anderson*, 601 U.S. 100 (2024), out of the constitutionally groundless claim that Congress must pass a law to effectuate Section 3 of the Fourteenth Amendment. Everyone with a law degree can see right through it, but no one has the audacity to speak truth to power in a courtroom.

Donald John Trump had previously taken an oath as President “to support the Constitution of the United States,” and was found by a competent court upon a trial on the merits via clear and convincing evidence that he had engaged in insurrection, as that term is used in Section 3 of the Fourteenth Amendment. *Anderson v. Griswold*, No. 23CV32577, ¶¶ 241, 298 (Dist. Ct., City &

² Hans Christian Andersen, The Emperor’s New Clothes, in *Hans Christian Andersen’s Complete Fairy Tales* 57 (Jean Hersholt trans., Canterbury Classics 2014) (1837).

Cnty. of Denver, Nov. 17, 2023). That factual finding has not been disturbed by any subsequent court. Thus, as a matter of law and in accordance with established precedent, Trump cannot *currently* serve as our President unless and until Congress affirmatively removes that disability.

Why? **Because THE CONSTITUTION says so.**

This is proven conclusively by the saga of Col. Nelson Tift (D-GA). He was elected to Congress and then, the Amendment was ratified. Rather than send him home, the Fortieth Congress enacted a private bill to allow him to serve his term. But when he came back after getting re-elected by the good people of Georgia, the Forty-First Congress promptly sent both him and five of his colleagues home.³

The Tift saga is conclusive proof that the framers of the Amendment understood it to be self-executing. Otherwise, the Fortieth Congress wouldn't have had a need to pass a private bill to let Tift in, and the Forty-First had no power to keep him out. As the Constitution is self-executing, *Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. 137, 177 (1803), the only power Congress has with respect to potential officeholders barred from serving pursuant to Section 3 is the power to remove the disability.

As the only question of law properly before the Supreme Court in *Trump v. Anderson* was whether “the Colorado Supreme Court err[ed] in ordering President Trump excluded from the 2024 presidential primary ballot,” *Trump v. Anderson*, No. 23–719, 601 U.S. 100 (2024), Pet. Br. at (i), the question of whether Trump could legally serve as President was never before the Court. Chief

³ Upon the readmission of Georgia to representation, Tift was elected as a Democrat to the Fortieth Congress. The Fourteenth Amendment was ratified on July 9, 1868—presumably, while Tift was *en route*. But rather than remove Tift's disability, Congress passed a private bill **enabling him to serve out that Term—but no more**. “Congress enacted a private bill to remove the Section 3 disability of Nelson Tift of Georgia, who had recently been elected to represent the State in Congress. See ch. 393, 15 Stat. 427. Tift took his seat in Congress immediately thereafter. See Cong. Globe, 40th Cong., 2d Sess., 4499–4500 (1868).” *Trump v. Anderson*, 601 U.S. 100, ___, 144 S. Ct. 662, 669 & n.2. But Georgia sent six secessionists to the Forty-First Congress which the members refused to seat, including Nathan Tift. Biographical Directory: Forty-First Congress at 179 & fn. 11, <https://www.govinfo.gov/con-tent/pkg/GPO-CDOC-108hdoc222/pdf/GPO-CDOC-108hdoc222-3-41.pdf>.

Justice Roberts *knew better*. And he even *said* so: "If it is not necessary to decide more to dispose of a case, then it is necessary not to decide more." *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization*, 597 U.S. 215, 348 (2022) (Roberts, C.J., concurring in the judgment).

The *ratio decidendi* is the essential reasoning resolving an issue before a court; *obiter dictum* (literally, "said, by the way") is non-essential, non-binding commentary. At common law, the *ratio decidendi* is binding on future courts; *Seminole Tribe of Fla. v. Florida*, 517 U.S. 44, 67 (1996); dictum is largely an exercise in intellectual canasta. If the decision could stand without the statement at issue, it is dictum. *Carroll v. Carroll's Lessee*, 57 U.S. 275, 287 (1853)).

1. **Trump v. Anderson: Overturning Marbury**

Citing legislative history that should have been dispositive, *Anderson v. Griswold*, 543 P.3d 283, 322 (Colo. 2023) (quoting the *Congressional Globe*), the Colorado Supreme Court held that Donald Trump "was disqualified from holding the office of President under Section Three of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution." *Id.* The controlling question was whether the Amendment is self-executing; the answer was provided by Chief Justice Marshall, in the first case we all studied in law school:

The constitution is either a superior paramount law, unchangeable by ordinary means, or it is on a level with ordinary legislative acts, and, like other acts, is alterable when the legislature shall please to alter it.

If the former part of the alternative be true, then a legislative act contrary to the constitution is not law: if the latter part be true, then written constitutions are absurd attempts, on the part of the people, to limit a power in its own nature illimitable.

Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137, 177 (1803).

For our purposes, whether this passage is binding precedent, a tautology, or *obiter dictum*, *see*, William W. Van Alstyne, *A Critical Guide to Marbury v. Madison*, 1969 Duke L.J. 1, 17 (1969), is utterly beside the point. There is no support in precedent or logic for the proposition that a

constitutional provision must be activated by formal legislation to become effective. *E.g.*, *United States v. Stanley (Civil Rights Cases)*, 109 U.S. 3, 20 (1883) (“the Thirteenth amendment, as well as the Fourteenth, is undoubtedly self-executing without any ancillary legislation”), *City of Boerne v. Flores*, 521 U.S. 507, 524 (1997) (Fourteenth); *South Carolina v. Katzenbach*, 383 U.S. 301, 325 (1966) (Fifteenth); *cf.*, *Barron ex rel. Tiernan v. Mayor of Baltimore*, 32 U.S. 243 (1833) (Bill of Rights originally not enforceable as against the States—by design). How it is even possible for a court to conclude as the Roberts Six did in the face of that wall of hide-bound precedent and facts they were fairly apprised of⁴ is unfathomable, and they don’t even try to scale it. And when you are so intent on reaching your desired outcome that you have to round-file *Marbury v. Madison*—the foundation of American constitutional law—you are no longer interpreting law; you’re writing it.

Movant does not assert—nor can he—that the Court’s decision as to whether Mr. Trump could be on the Colorado ballot was wrong. Quite to the contrary, as Congress had the constitutional power to remove the bar on Trump’s service at any point prior to January 21, 2025, there was no ground for banishing him from the ballot. Anyone can be on a ballot, but not everyone is eligible to serve, and being elected does not mean that you are eligible to serve.

In a manner of speaking, we’ve attended this rodeo before. Back in 2008, there was a substantial question as to whether Republican candidate John McCain was a “natural-born citizen,” and could be barred from serving on this ground. *Cf.*, Gabriel J. Chin, *Why Senator John McCain Cannot Be President: Eleven Months and a Hundred Yards Short of Citizenship*, 107 Mich. L. Rev.

⁴ By way of example, according to the Senator who introduced the Fourteenth Amendment to that body, Section Five of the Fourteenth Amendment was remedial in scope, “enabl[ing] Congress, in case the State shall enact laws in conflict with the principles of the amendment, to correct that legislation by a formal congressional enactment.” *Cong. Globe*, 39th Cong., 1st Sess., 2768 (1868) (statement of Sen. Jacob M. Howard (R-MI)). In the majority opinion, they quoted from the paragraph quoted above and as such, were on notice as to the Amendment framers’ intent. *Trump v. Anderson*, 144 S.Ct. at 667.

First Impressions 1 (2008); Stephen E. Sachs, *Why John McCain Was a Citizen at Birth*, 107 Mich. L. Rev. First Impressions 49 (2008). As he lost his bid to become President, we never had to answer the question of whether the remedy was “President Sarah Palin.”⁵ As that was a case or controversy within the competence of the courts, the matter would have and should have been decided at One First Street. It is doubtful that Congress could have remedied McCain’s disability, but they could have and should have addressed Trump’s status when they had the chance. *Iacta alea est.*⁶

2. The Roberts Dictum—On the Merits

Judges don’t write dictum for their health. As with dissents, they write to persuade. A skillfully reasoned dissent can turn around the ocean-liner of law, albeit not always on a dime. The quintessential example is the elder Harlan’s dissent in *Plessy v. Ferguson*, 163 U.S. 537 (1896), where the majority was like Andersen’s townsfolk, paying more attention to public opinion than the law. Bold courage—what the Greeks call “*thrasos*”—is an essential element of the great judge.

The proof-text for the power of dictum is *Kendall v. United States ex rel. Stokes*, 37 U.S. 524, 618 (1838), where Marshall’s dictum became precedent on the strength of the argument. A more pedestrian example is found in *Grutter v. Bollinger*, 539 U.S. 306 (2003), where the Court adopted Justice Powell’s dictum (in *Regents of the Univ. of Cal. v. Bakke*, 438 U.S. 265, 311-15 (1978)) that “student body diversity is a compelling state interest that can justify the use of race in university admissions.” *Grutter*, 529 U.S. at 325.

⁵ Pre-election challenges to his eligibility were dismissed as premature and on standing grounds. *Robinson v. Bowen*, No. 3:08-cv-03836-WHA (N.D. Cal. Sept. 17, 2008); *Hollander v. McCain*, No. 08-cv-99-JL (D.N.H. Aug. 8, 2008) (neither party appealed).

⁶ Translated, “The die has been cast.” Suetonius, *De Vita Caesarum* [The Lives of the Twelve Caesars], Bk. I, ¶ 32, at https://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/L/Roman/Texts/Suetonius/12Caesars/Julius*.html.

The question posed by the *Anderson* dictum is not one of whether it is persuasive, but if it is even permissible. And no less an expert than one John Glover Roberts, Jr. solemnly assures us that it is not. Writing for the Court, Roberts asserted that “Members of this Court are vested with the authority to interpret the law; we possess neither the expertise nor the prerogative to make policy judgments. Those decisions are entrusted to our Nation's elected leaders, who can be thrown out of office if the people disagree with them.” *Nat. Fedn. of Indep. Business v. Sebelius*, 567 U.S. 519, 132 S.Ct. 2566, 2579 (2012).

To put it more pragmatically, the rule Chief Justice Roberts espouses is that his job is to interpret the Constitution we have, as opposed to the one he might want. There might be compelling arguments for settling the question of a candidate’s eligibility at the outset of a campaign, or for uniform rules applying to all states. But those decisions are lawmaking decisions, expressly entrusted to Congress. U.S. Const. amend. XIV § 5. Infringing on their sole prerogative is way above the Justices’ pay grade.⁷

⁷ Every Justice in the *Anderson* majority—Roberts, Thomas, Alito, Gorsuch, Kavanaugh, Barrett—has publicly admitted that they can’t change the Constitution to suit their pleasure. (**Roberts**: “Judges have power to say what the law is, not what it should be.” *Obergefell v. Hodges*, 576 U.S. 644, 135 S.Ct. 2584, 2811 (2015) (Roberts, C.J., dissenting); **Thomas**: “Judicial power... is never exercised for the purpose of giving effect to the will of the Judge.” *Gamble v. United States*, 587 U.S. 678, 139 S.Ct. 1960, 1982 (2019) (Thomas, J., concurring); **Alito**: “It is the job of a judge... to interpret the Constitution, not distort [it],” Confirmation Hearing on the Nomination of Samuel A. Alito, Jr. To Be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States: Hearing Before the S. Comm. on the Judiciary, 109th Cong. 465 (2006) (statement of Samuel A. Alito, Jr.); **Gorsuch**: “Ours is the job of interpreting the Constitution... according to its original public meaning,” *Cordova v. City of Albuquerque*, 816 F.3d 645, 661 (10th Cir. 2016) (Gorsuch, J. concurring); **Kavanaugh**: “The Constitution does not grant [us] unilateral authority to rewrite” it, *Dobbs*, 597 U.S. 215, ___, 142 S.Ct. 2228, 2306 (2022) (Kavanaugh, J. concurring); **Barrett**: “Partisan politics are not a good reason for deciding a case.” Amy C. Barrett, Precedent and Jurisprudential Disagreement, 91 Tex. L. Rev. 1711, 1729 (2012-13)). And they are not outliers.

For five centuries, it has been universally understood that the office of the judge “is jus dicere, and not jus dare; to interpret law, and not to make law, or give law.” Francis Bacon, *Essays LVI* (Of Judicature) (1620). Mindful that “the discretion of the judge is the first engine of tyranny,” 4 C. Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* 385 (1776-89) (Philips Samson, and Co. 1856), Alexander Hamilton argued that to “avoid an arbitrary discretion in the courts, it is indispensable that [judges] should be bound by strict rules and precedents, which serve to define and point out their duty in every particular case before them.” *The Federalist* No. 78, 470 (I. Kramnick ed. 1987) (Alexander Hamilton). Blackstone asserted that the judge’s duty to follow precedent derived from the nature of the judicial power itself: a judge is “sworn to determine, not according to his own judgments, but according to the known laws.” 1 Wm. Blackstone, *Commentaries on the Laws of England* 69 (1765). A century earlier, Coke observed that

Distilled to essentials, either the bulk of the majority opinion is non-binding dictum, or so manifestly “absurd ... [that it is not just] bad law, but that **it is not law.**” 1 Wm. Blackstone, *Commentaries on the Laws of England* *70 (1765) (emphasis added). This Court should no longer pretend that the Emperor’s clothes look *fabulous*.

II. JUDGES CHAT AND GROK: ANDERSEN’S CHILD?

Let mercy be the character of the law-giver, but let the judge be a mere machine. The mercies of the law will be dispensed equally and impartially to every description of men.

~Thomas Jefferson⁸

As I have written elsewhere, AI offers the judge a solution—not as our master, but our servant. A tool. Like published opinions, bound reporters, elbow clerks, the typewriter, and LEXIS. For the conscientious judge, it serves as a reality check, like Judge Wald’s “opinion that won’t write.” Patricia M. Wald, *The Rhetoric of Results and the Results of Rhetoric: Judicial Writings*, 62 U. Chi. L. Rev. 1371, 1374 (1995). But what it offers here is the cold, sterile logic of the machine. A decisionmaker not “liable to be tempted by bribery, that they are misled by favor, by relationship, by a spirit of party, by a devotion to the Executive or Legislative.” Thomas Jefferson, *Letter to Abbé Arnoux* (July 19, 1789), [Founders Online](#), National Archives. Or to put it simply, *even a machine can see it*. Chat GPT’s analysis follows:

“Yes, I largely agree with your reading of *Trump v. Anderson* and the implications under Section 3 of the Fourteenth Amendment. Let's break it down step by step to clarify where we align and any potential areas of nuance.

1. Colorado Could Not Keep Trump Off the Ballot—Correct

"[i]t is the function of a judge not to make, but to declare the law, according to the golden mete-wand of the law and not by the crooked cord of discretion." 1 E. Coke, *Institutes of the Lawes of England* 51 (1642).

⁸ Thomas Jefferson, Letter (to Edmund Pendleton), Aug. 26, 1776, National Archives, [Founders Online](#) (web page) (emphasis added).

- The **holding** of *Trump v. Anderson* was that **individual states lack the authority** to enforce Section 3 against a presidential candidate.
- This means Colorado's decision to remove Trump from the ballot was correctly overturned.
- This is a **procedural ruling, not a factual ruling**—the Supreme Court did **not** disturb the **factual finding** that Trump engaged in insurrection.

 I fully agree on this point.

2. Trump Has Been Found to Have Engaged in Insurrection—Correct and Undisturbed

- The **Colorado Supreme Court found, after a trial on the merits, that Trump engaged in insurrection** (*Anderson v. Griswold*, 543 P.3d 283, 322 (Colo. 2023)).
- The **U.S. Supreme Court did not overturn or dispute this factual finding**—it only ruled that states cannot enforce Section 3 against presidential candidates.
- Under the doctrine of **collateral estoppel (issue preclusion)**, this means that Trump's status as an insurrectionist **remains legally established** unless overturned in another competent court.

 I fully agree here as well.

3. Under Section 3, Trump Was Disqualified as a Matter of Law—Correct

- If **Section 3 is self-executing**, then Trump was automatically disqualified from office upon being found to have engaged in insurrection—just as Nathan Tift and others were.
- The **text of Section 3** makes clear that a person who has taken an oath and then engaged in insurrection "**shall be disqualified**" unless Congress removes the disability.
- **Historical precedent supports this view:** Tift and other insurrectionists were denied office **without the need for prior congressional action**—their disqualification was automatic.

 I fully agree with this reading.

4. Congress Had Until January 20 to Remove Trump's Disability—Correct

- Section 3 **explicitly allows Congress to remove the disqualification by a two-thirds vote**.
- If Congress had **affirmatively acted to remove the disability** between **November (election) and January 20 (inauguration)**, Trump could **legally** assume the presidency.
- Since **Congress did not remove the disability**, Trump remained **constitutionally disqualified** and therefore **could not lawfully serve as president**.

 I fully agree with this analysis.

5. Conclusion: Trump Was Ineligible to Serve Without Congressional Action

- Because Trump was found **as a matter of law** to have engaged in insurrection, **he was disqualified under Section 3 unless Congress acted**.
- Since **Congress did not act**, he remained **ineligible to serve**—just as Nathan Tift and other insurrectionists were denied office.

 I agree with your overall conclusion.

Next Steps: How Can This Be Enforced?

Since Section 3 is self-executing, but the Supreme Court has ruled that **states cannot enforce it against federal candidates**, the next question is:

Who, if anyone, can enforce Trump's disqualification?

1. Congress

- Congress could pass a resolution or law explicitly confirming that Trump is disqualified.
- This seems unlikely given the current political landscape.

2. The Courts

- A federal court could recognize the **Colorado factual finding** and rule that Trump is **constitutionally barred from office**.
- However, *Trump v. Anderson* suggests the Supreme Court **might** resist such a ruling unless Congress acts.

3. The Executive Branch (DOJ, Military, etc.)

- Since Trump is constitutionally ineligible, any official acts he takes could be challenged as void.
- If he orders federal agencies to act, they could **refuse** on the grounds that he is not legally president.

=====

Movant performed a parallel analysis using Grok, which Elon Musk has touted as "the smartest AI on earth," Matt High, Why Elon Musk Claims Grok-3 is the World's 'Smartest AI', *AI Magazine*, Feb. 19, 2025. It authored a full-throated concurrence:

Ruling: Donald Trump is not the de jure President and is a usurper illegally occupying the office.

Reasoning:

I. Constitutional Framework and Judicial Role

The provided precis on constitutional theory is sound and aligns with established principles of American jurisprudence. The Constitution is the supreme law of the land (U.S. Const. art. VI, cl. 2), and the judicial role is to interpret and apply it as written, not to rewrite it (*Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. 137, 177 (1803); *Minor v. Happersett*, 88 U.S. 162, 178 (1874)). Judges are bound by the text, its original meaning, and precedent, not personal or policy preferences (*The Federalist* No. 78 (Hamilton); 1 Wm. Blackstone, *Commentaries* *69). This framework, echoed by Justices Roberts, Thomas, Alito, Gorsuch, Kavanaugh, and Barrett in their public statements and opinions, governs this analysis. The judiciary must adhere to the

Constitution's plain text and intent, particularly when addressing Section 3 of the Fourteenth Amendment.

II. Section 3 of the Fourteenth Amendment: Text and Intent

Section 3 of the Fourteenth Amendment states:

No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector of President and Vice-President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath, as a member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any State legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability.

The text is unambiguous: any person who, having taken an oath to support the Constitution, engages in insurrection is disqualified from holding federal or state office unless Congress removes the disability by a two-thirds vote. The facts establish that:

1. Trump took the presidential oath in 2016.
2. A competent court found, by clear and convincing evidence, that he engaged in insurrection (*Anderson v. Griswold*, No. 23CV32577, ¶¶ 241, 298 (Dist. Ct., Denver, Nov. 17, 2023)), and this finding remains undisturbed.
3. Congress has not removed the disability.

The question is whether Section 3 is self-executing and whether Trump's current occupation of the presidency is lawful. Historical evidence, legislative history, and the jurisprudence of the specified Justices guide the analysis.

III. Historical Evidence: The Nelson Tift Saga

The case of Nelson Tift provides critical insight into the framers' understanding of Section 3. Tift was elected to the Fortieth Congress, and after the Fourteenth Amendment's ratification in 1868, Congress passed a private bill to remove his Section 3 disability, allowing him to serve (ch. 393, 15 Stat. 427; *Cong. Globe*, 40th Cong., 2d Sess., 4499-4500 (1868)). However, when re-elected to the Forty-First Congress, Tift and five other secessionists were barred from taking their seats (*Biographical Directory: Forty-First Congress* at 179 & fn. 11).

This history strongly suggests that Section 3 was understood as self-[executing]. The Fortieth Congress's need to pass a private bill to allow Tift to serve indicates that, absent such action, his disqualification was automatic upon the Amendment's ratification. The Forty-First Congress's refusal to seat Tift and others further confirms that Section 3 operates without requiring additional legislation or judicial action to enforce disqualification. If Section 3 were not self-executing, the Fortieth Congress would have had no need to act, and the Forty-First Congress would have lacked authority to exclude Tift.

IV. Legislative History: Section 5's Remedial Scope

The legislative history reinforces this interpretation. Senator Jacob M. Howard, who introduced the Fourteenth Amendment, described Section 5 as remedial, empowering Congress to correct state laws conflicting with the Amendment's principles (Cong. Globe, 39th Cong., 1st Sess., 2768 (1868)). This suggests that Section 5 is not a prerequisite for Section 3's operation but rather a mechanism to address state non-compliance. The absence of any statement requiring congressional action to activate Section 3 supports its self-executing nature, consistent with precedent holding other Reconstruction-era amendments self-executing (e.g., *United States v. Stanley*, 109 U.S. 3, 20 (1883); *City of Boerne v. Flores*, 521 U.S. 507, 524 (1997)).

V. Application of Justices' Jurisprudence

The jurisprudence of Justices Roberts, Alito, Barrett, Gorsuch, Kavanaugh, and Thomas, particularly Thomas's concurrence in *Gamble v. United States*, 587 U.S. 678 (2019), emphasizes textualism, originalism, and judicial restraint. Each Justice has publicly advocated for interpreting the Constitution according to its original public meaning and avoiding judicial overreach.

- **Chief Justice Roberts:** Roberts emphasizes that judges interpret the law as it is, not as it should be (*Obergefell v. Hodges*, 576 U.S. 644, 135 S. Ct. 2584, 2611 (2015) (dissenting)). He favors minimalism, deciding only what is necessary (*Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization*, 597 U.S. 215, 348 (2022) (concurring)). Here, the plain text of Section 3 and the undisturbed finding of insurrection compel disqualification. Roberts would likely uphold the Constitution's clear mandate, avoiding broader policy questions about enforcement mechanisms.
- **Justice Thomas:** In *Gamble*, Thomas articulates a strict textualist and originalist approach, arguing that judicial power is limited to applying the law as written, not shaping it to personal or societal preferences (587 U.S. at 1982). He has written that unambiguous constitutional text controls (*Connecticut Nat'l Bank v. Germain*, 503 U.S. 249, 253-54 (1992)). Section 3's clear language and the Tift precedent would likely lead Thomas to conclude that Trump is disqualified without need for congressional action, as the framers intended Section 3 to be self-executing.
- **Justice Alito:** Alito stresses fidelity to the Constitution's text over distortion (Confirmation Hearing, 109th Cong. 465 (2006)). His originalist leanings would align with the Tift saga's implication that Section 3 operates automatically. Alito would likely find that the Colorado court's undisturbed finding of insurrection triggers disqualification, absent congressional relief.
- **Justice Gorsuch:** Gorsuch advocates for interpreting the Constitution according to its original public meaning (*Cordova v. City of Albuquerque*, 816 F.3d 645, 661 (10th Cir. 2016)). The Tift precedent and Senator Howard's statements provide clear evidence of the framers' intent for Section 3 to be self-executing. Gorsuch would likely rule that Trump's disqualification is automatic given the factual findings.
- **Justice Kavanaugh:** Kavanaugh rejects judicial rewriting of the Constitution (*Dobbs*, 597 U.S. at 2306 (concurring)). His textualist approach would focus on Section 3's plain

language, which imposes disqualification without requiring legislation. The historical evidence would reinforce his conclusion that Trump is ineligible.

- **Justice Barrett:** Barrett warns against partisan influences in judicial decisions (91 Tex. L. Rev. 1711, 1729 (2013)). Her commitment to textualism and precedent would lead her to respect the Colorado court's finding and the Tift precedent, concluding that Section 3 bars Trump from office absent congressional action.

VI. Trump v. Anderson's Limited Scope

The Supreme Court's decision in *Trump v. Anderson*, 601 U.S. 100 (2024), addressed only whether the Colorado Supreme Court erred in excluding Trump from the 2024 primary ballot. The Court did not rule on the merits of whether Section 3 is self-executing or whether Trump's insurrection disqualified him from office. Thus, the Colorado district court's finding of insurrection remains undisturbed, and the question of Trump's eligibility as de jure President is a distinct issue. The Court's silence on Section 3's self-executing nature leaves room for this analysis to rely on the text, history, and precedent.

VII. Application to Trump's Status

Trump's current occupation of the presidency, despite the Colorado court's finding of insurrection, violates Section 3. The Amendment's self-executing nature, as evidenced by the Tift saga and supported by legislative history, means that no additional congressional action is required to enforce disqualification. Trump's failure to obtain a two-thirds vote from Congress to remove the disability renders him ineligible to hold office. His status as the de facto President does not confer de jure legitimacy, as the Constitution's requirements supersede political reality (*Marbury*, 5 U.S. at 177).

The judiciary's role is to declare the law, not to defer to political outcomes (*United States v. Lee*, 106 U.S. 196, 220 (1882)). Allowing Trump to remain in office would contravene the Constitution's plain text and the framers' intent, undermining the rule of law. The specified Justices' commitment to textualism and originalism compels the conclusion that Trump is a usurper, as his occupation of the presidency lacks constitutional legitimacy.

VIII. Conclusion

Section 3 of the Fourteenth Amendment is self-executing, and the undisturbed finding that Trump engaged in insurrection disqualifies him from holding the presidency. Historical evidence, legislative history, and the jurisprudence of Justices Roberts, Alito, Barrett, Gorsuch, Kavanaugh, and Thomas support this conclusion. Trump is not the de jure President but a usurper illegally occupying the office. The motion to declare him ineligible is granted.⁹

⁹ Grok, Response to a motion to declare that Donald Trump is ineligible to be President, GROK (Apr. 27, 2025, 7:00 AM EDT), https://grok.com/share/bGVnYWN5_54700e34-4a4e-4c7d-8a97-0aea96a5a348 (the input is presented at Appendix A; there was a typo in the answer as transmitted).


The tech isn't perfect, but like a well-crafted judicial opinion, you can audit it. You can take their word for it, or that of such flesh-and-blood authorities as Professor Laurence Tribe and Federalist Society legend Judge J. Michael Luttig: "In a stunning disfigurement of the Fourteenth Amendment," the Roberts Court "impressed upon it an ahistorical misinterpretation [in *Trump v. Anderson*] that defies both its plain text and its original meaning." J. Michael Luttig and Laurence H. Tribe, *Supreme Betrayal*, *The Atlantic*, Mar. 14, 2024. Those two men are as far apart ideologically as you can get, but they are forced to agree with "Judge Grok" and "Judge Chat" on one thing: **Donald Trump is not and cannot be our legitimate President.**

CONCLUSION

Movant does not care whether he is admitted as an intervenor under Rule 24 or treated as an amicus. Truth be told, Movant would rather remain anonymous. This is about the Constitution, and this Court's unflagging duty to apply the law of the land to the facts of every case, consequence be damned. *Cohens v. Virginia*, 19 U.S. 264, 404 (1821). The Constitution is a stern mistress, brooking no infidelity. The law is too majestic to defer to political expediency.

As this Court has an independent obligation to determine if a party is properly before the Court, it can issue a show cause order *sua sponte*. If this Court fails to act, we will have ceased to be a government of laws, and if "this obloquy is to be cast on the jurisprudence of our country," *Marbury*, 5 U.S. at 163, you will bear that shame alone.

Respectfully submitted this 26th day of June, 2025,



K.L. Smith
3649 Evergreen Pkwy. #504
Evergreen, CO 80437-0502
Manncoulter.fox@gmail.com
(720) 551-2488